

respect to the above shipment in that it was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of, another article.

Misbranding of the article was alleged with respect to the shipment labeled "Distilled Colored Vinegar" in that the statement borne on the barrels containing the article was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, in that it represented that said article was distilled colored vinegar, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not distilled colored vinegar, but was a mixture composed in part of excessive water. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the above shipment was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the distinctive name of, another article.

On October 6, 1919, the defendant entered a plea of guilty, and the court imposed a fine of \$100.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

8085. Misbranding of cottonseed feed. U. S. * * * v. Glen Allen Oil Mill, a Corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25 and costs. (F. & D. No. 9908. I. S. No. 7159-p.)

On January 5, 1920, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Mississippi, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Glen Allen Oil Mill, Glen Allen, Miss., alleging shipment by said defendant company, on or about November 15, 1917, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, from the State of Mississippi into the State of Maine, of a quantity of cottonseed feed which was misbranded. The article was labeled in part "Guaranteed Analysis Jay Brand F. W. Brode & Co. Memphis, Tenn. Jobbers Established, 1875. Cotton Seed Feed 100 lbs. gross. 99 lbs. net. Ammonia, Minimum, 7.00% Protein, Minimum 36.00%."

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

	Per cent.
Nitrogen -----	5.45
Ammonia -----	6.62
Protein -----	34.05

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that the statements "Ammonia, Minimum 7.00%" and "Protein, Minimum 36.00%," borne on the tags attached to the article, were false and misleading, and deceived and misled the purchaser, in that they represented that said article contained not less than 7 per cent of ammonia and not less than 36 per cent of protein, whereas, in truth and in fact, said article did contain less than 7 per cent of ammonia and did contain less than 36 per cent of protein.

On July 5, 1920, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty, and the court imposed a fine of \$25 and costs.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

8086. Adulteration and misbranding of oil of sassafras. U. S. * * * v. 1 Package Containing 60 Pounds of a Product Purporting to be Oil of Sassafras. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and sale. (F. & D. No. 9939. I. S. No. 12831-r. S. No. E-1272.)

On March 25, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 1 package, containing 60 pounds of a product purporting to be oil of sassafras, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Boston, Mass.,

alleging that the article had been shipped on or about February 22, 1919, by Charles V. Sparhawk, New York, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the State of Massachusetts, and charging adulteration and misbranding under the Food and Drugs Act.

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted largely of imitation oil of sassafras obtained from camphor oil, with a small amount of natural oil of sassafras.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia, and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by tests therein laid down, and in that it fell below the professed standard of quality under which it was sold, in that it consisted in whole or in part of synthetic oil of sassafras made from waste camphor oil, with a small amount of natural oil of sassafras.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that a product consisting in whole or in part of synthetic oil of sassafras, made from waste camphor oil with a small amount of natural oil of sassafras, an imitation of oil of sassafras, was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article, to wit, oil of sassafras.

On July 6, 1920, no claimant having appeared for the property, a default decree of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be sold at public auction by the United States marshal.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

8087. Misbranding of Knoxit. U. S. * * * 45 Bottles of So-Called Knoxit. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 9940. I. S. No. 6882-r. S. No. C-1124.)

On March 27, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Kansas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 45 bottles of so-called Knoxit, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Atchison, Kans., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about March 1, 1919, by the Beggs Manufacturing Co., Chicago, Ill., and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of Kansas, and charging misbranding under the Food and Drugs Act as amended. The article was labeled in part, "Knoxit The great Prophylactic."

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of a dilute aqueous solution containing zinc acetate, hydrastis, and glycerin, perfumed with oil of rose.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the statements regarding the curative and therapeutic effects thereof, appearing on the labels and in the circulars accompanying the article, falsely and fraudulently represented that the article was the great prophylactic for inflammation of the mucous membranes and a highly efficacious remedy used in the treatment of catarrhal affections of the eyes, nose and throat, and inflammation of the mucous membranes.

On January 12, 1920, no claimant having appeared for the property, a decree of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*